

**Andersen, James**

---

ED0 From: Andersen, James -ED0  
Sent: Tuesday, September 07, 2010 3:26 PM  
To: Giessner, John  
Subject: RE: SOARCA TA brief

Jack, I think RES will need to put in an extension request pushing the Oct 29 date to Jun 2011. Is that correct?

Jim A.

-----Original Message-----

ED0 From: Giessner, John  
Sent: Tuesday, September 07, 2010 3:10 PM  
To: Mamish, Nader; Andersen, James  
Subject: FW: SOARCA TA brief

This was the exchange Mike and I on the SOARCA brief. You may hear about this from other CMN offices. Our current plan is now, EDO daily in October (no paper to the CMN). Final recommendation and CMN meeting next summer

John (Jack) Giessner  
Executive Technical Assistant (on rotation) EDO Office  
301-415-2176 office

ED0 -----Original Message-----

From: Weber, Michael  
Sent: Friday, September 03, 2010 7:42 PM  
To: Giessner, John  
Cc: Sheron, Brian; Lyons, James; Andersen, James; Mamish, Nader  
Subject: Response - SOARCA TA brief

Thanks. Let's let it ride. See what develops. The Chairman strongly supported the daily with no paper because there are no policy issues at this time.

----- Original Message -----

ED0 From: Giessner, John  
To: Weber, Michael  
Sent: Fri Sep 03 16:56:56 2010  
Subject: SOARCA TA brief

The TA were very engaged. All reactor TAs were present (Marshall for the CHM). The meeting went almost 2 hrs for a scheduled 1 hour meeting.

Many questions on the plan to communicate with the public, what next (we said that was next June where we would provide a paper with recommendations), what we found so far and the uncertainty analysis. These they seemed ok with.

Two sticking points:

- 4 TAs (not the CHM's) led by Franovich did not like the vehicle to transmit the draft info to them. They said it was important and it should be an info paper. I explained we looked at this and discussed with SECY and since it had no policy implications, we felt that we could keep the CMN informed with links to the documents. They were un-moved and most nodded they wanted something more. I indicated I would revalidate the info,

but felt our method provided prompt information. You may hear about this in your periodics and there was some rumbling they may bring it up during CMN planning meeting.

My thought, if you're OK is to proceed as planned and revalidate with SECY.

- the timing of the uncertainty analysis and release of info to the public. Some TAs didn't see a need to wait for uncertainty analysis; others wanted to wait for the uncertainty work prior to releasing anything to the public; one TA (Snodderly) said he would recommend to his CMR that a full ACRS meeting with a letter recommending OK to go public with draft. Other discussions on if we wanted to engage the public with the uncertainty analysis ensued. Suffice it to say there were many thoughts.

Big picture the TA's wanted the staff to understand: this could have policy implications; that is why it is important to them. We agreed.

Have a good weekend!

Jack

(Sent from Blackberry)